

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Attached hereto is one (1) sheet of corrected formal drawings. The corrected formal drawings incorporate the following drawing changes:

**In FIG. 5, the reference numeral 60 has been removed; the reference numerals 62 and 64 have been added.**

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

### **REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 4-6, 12 and 13 are now present in the application. The drawings have been amended. Claim 7 has been cancelled in this Reply. Claim 4 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner in the outstanding Office Action has indicated that claims 4-6 are allowed. Although not indicated in the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner also indicated that claims 12 and 13 (dependent from allowed independent claim 4) are allowed during a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on December 7, 2006. Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

### **Information Disclosure Citation**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 18, 2006 and August 9, 2006, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

### **Drawings**

The drawings have been amended to remove the presence of minor informalities. Applicants have submitted one (1) sheet of corrected formal drawings. Applicants respectfully

submit that no new matter is entered. Entry of the above amendments to the drawings is earnestly solicited.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lucke, U.S. Patent No. 1,833,166. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, claim 7 has been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

### **Additional Cited References**

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but rather to merely show the state of the art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

**CONCLUSION**

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

